Monroe doctrine
Pub. Pol. Sci. Govt. K

# THE MONROE DOCTRINE



## A COMPLETE HISTORY

comp. by C. Kohler

3 1761 09702266 9

# THE MONROE DOCTRINE



## A COMPLETE HISTORY

COMPILED BY
CHARLES KOHLER
SAVANNAH, GA.

# THE MONROE DOCTRINE



A COMPLETE HISTORY

ENTERED ACCORDING TO ACT OF CONGRESS
IN THE YEAR 1903
BY
CHARLES KOHLER AND FRANK E. PURSE
IN THE OFFICE OF THE LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS
AT WASHINGTON

## The American Foreign Policy Announced by Washington.

WHAT proved to be the foreign policy of the United States for more than one hundred years is found in Washington's Farewell Address. "Observe good faith and justice toward all nations, cultivate peace and harmony with all. * * * In the execution of such a plan nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations, and passionate attachments for others should be excluded; and that in place of them, just and amicable feelings toward all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges toward another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. * * * Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. * * * Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake; since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. * * * Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence therefore it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves by artificial ties in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities. Our detached and distant

situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people under an efficient government the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation; when we may choose peace or war, as our interest guided by justice shall counsel. * * * It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world."

As Europe guards so jealously the "balance of power," or "*status quo*" on her continent as to deem any alteration of it by any power a "*casus belli*," so the United States regards the sentiment of "America for the Americans," crystallized into the Monroe Doctrine.

It was partly in pursuance of this policy that President Jefferson decided on the Louisiana Purchase. That portion of what is now almost the center of the United States, having already been ceded from Spain to France, was again in danger of having its ownership transferred to another foreign nation. France, being at war with England, would in all probability have had the Louisiana territory wrested from her. Jefferson, by threatening to join England, was able to obtain that province from Napoleon for fifteen million dollars. Subsequent events proved the wisdom of Jefferson's action in procuring that magnificent domain for such a paltry sum.

As late as October 21, 1823 Jefferson wrote President Monroe "our first and fundamental maxim should be never to entangle ourselves in the broils of Europe. Our second, never to suffer Europe to intermeddle with cisatlantic affairs. America, north and south, has a set of interests distinct from those of Europe and peculiarly her own. She should therefore have a system of her own,

separate and apart from that of Europe." Jefferson's views coincided with practically all the prominent Americans.

Although that sentiment of "America for the Americans" was gradually but surely assuming a concrete form, it was partially due to British suggestion that it developed so suddenly under President Monroe into that important, vital doctrine known by his name. For with the powerful support of England, it became an insurmountable barrier to any future European colonization of America; and in the course of time even restricting England in her attempts at seizing disputed Venezuelan territory without arbitration. As Secretary Olney noted in his dispatch to Ambassador Bayard in the Venezuelan controversy "its pronouncement by the Monroe administration at that particular time was unquestionably due to the inspiration of Great Britain." All else to the contrary notwithstanding, to England who may or may not desire the honor, is to be given the credit of having suggested it, although in a different form and for her own selfish purposes. However much Americans may have felt such a policy desirable for their institutions the United States was not then able to defy all Europe until supported by a strong maritime power.

Its announcement on December 2, 1823 is due to what seemed an exigency in European politics at that time which affected British interests materially. The Czar of Russia formed an alliance between his country, Austria, Prussia and later France and England for "mutual protection" against domestic revolutions. In congress assembled these governments about 1820 decided to assist each other in maintaining the then existing dynasties, also to support each other in the suppression of their rebellious subjects. Although lukewarm, England at first acquiesced in this "Holy Alliance" and France sent troops into Spain to suppress a rebellion against Ferdinand VII.

When Lord George Canning succeeded Castlereagh

as Prime Minister, he feared that British interests might be threatened by the alliance and finally assumed an unfriendly attitude, thereby also posing as the friend of liberty.

About 1810 the American colonies of Spain began to revolt and declare themselves free and independent, and when Canning acceded to power several Spanish-American republics had been formally recognized by Great Britain and the United States as free and independent governments. Canning drew France into an agreement with England respecting Spanish-American countries. It is believed that Canning desired a partnership with the United States in regard to Central and South America. If so, President Monroe certainly disappointed him for his famous message says nothing favorable to an alliance with England or any other country.

Great Britain had built up a considerable trade with Spain's former American colonies which she was unable to do, so long as they were under the Spanish yoke. Consequently when Spain attempted to reconquer these colonies (whose independence she had never acknowledged), it was regarded by England as a positive menace to her commerce. Canning feared that Spain intended enlisting the active assistance of the governments forming the Holy Alliance in her behalf. He hoped that the United States and England might appropriate such countries of South America as were agreeable to each. But Monroe would not enter wholly into his scheme. On the 23d day of August, 1823 Richard Rush, the American Minister to the court of St. James, wrote John Quincy Adams, Secretary of State under Monroe, "I yesterday received from Mr. Canning a note, headed 'private and confidential', setting before me in a more distinct form the proposition respecting South American affairs, which he communicated in conversation on the 16th. The tone of earnestness in Mr. Canning's note and the force of some of his expressions

naturally start the inference that the British Cabinet cannot be without its serious apprehensions that ambitious enterprises are meditated against the independence of the South American States. Whether by France alone I cannot say now on any authentic grounds. The private, confidential note of Mr. George Canning, Secretary of State for foreign affairs in his Brittanic Majesty's Cabinet, suggests: Is not the moment come when our governments might understand each other, as do the Spanish-American colonies? And if we can arrive at such an understanding, would it not be expedient for ourselves and beneficial for all the world, that the principles of it should be clearly settled and plainly avowed?" It was claimed that Spain, without assistance from some other country, was unable to subdue South America; that the United States was in a better position than Great Britain to make the announcement against Spain; that England would support the United States, if necessary, in this matter. That after Spain was exhausted in fruitless endeavor to reconquer her lost colonies England and the United States might divide them up among themselves. England had claimed the Mosquito Coast of Central America. Although Mr. Rush approved of Canning's suggestions he realized that they were of by far too much importance to give assurances off-hand and could only await the American Government's decision in the matter. He was satisfied, however, that President Monroe would approve them.

Adams, who was inclined to make light of the matter, of course laid it before the President and his cabinet.

As England aimed principally at France and the Holy Alliance, regarding them as inimical to her interests, and as intending to do the very thing that she herself desired, *i. e.* control Central and South America, Monroe would not agree to do exactly as suggested.

The danger which he and his compatriots saw was

"the aggressive spirit of European despotism, and the boon was our freedom, our republican government, our constitution and all the blessings flowing from and guaranteed by them."

If Monroe had any leanings in any direction at all, he rather favored France. However as he, Calhoun and the other Cabinet Officers were "very much afraid that the Holy Alliance would restore all of South America to Spain," he, after due consideration, promulgated his famous doctrine.

## The Monroe Doctrine.

*From his message of December 2nd, 1823.*

"IT WAS stated at the commencement of the last session that a great effort was then making in Spain and Portugal to improve the condition of the people of those countries, and that it appeared to be conducted with extraordinary moderation. It need scarcely be remarked that the result has been so far very different from what was then anticipated. Of events in that quarter of the globe, with which we have so much intercourse and from which we derive our origin, we have always been anxious and interested spectators. The citizens of the United States cherish sentiments the most friendly in favor of the liberty and happiness of their fellow-men on that side of the Atlantic.

In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy to do so. It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries or make preparation for our defense.

With the movements in this hemisphere we are of necessity more immediately connected, and by causes which must be obvious to all enlightened and impartial observers. The political system of the allied powers is essentially different in this respect from that of America. This difference proceeds from that which exists in their respective governments and to the defense of our own, which has been achieved by the loss of so much blood and treasure, and matured by the wisdom of their most enlightened citizens and under which we have enjoyed unexampled felicity, this whole nation is devoted. We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations

existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere. But with the Governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have on great consideration and on just principles acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States. In the war between those new Governments and Spain we declared our neutrality at the time of their recognition, and to this we have adhered, and shall continue to adhere, provided no change shall occur which, in the judgment of the competent authorities of this Government, shall make a corresponding change on the part of the United States indispensable to their security.

The late events in Spain and Portugal show that Europe is still unsettled. Of this important fact no stronger proof can be adduced than that the allied powers should have thought it proper, on any principle satisfactory to themselves, to have interposed by force in the internal concerns of Spain. To what extent such interposition may be carried, on the same principle, is a question in which all independent powers whose Governments differ from theirs are interested, even those most remote, and surely none more so than the United States. Our policy in regard to Europe, which was adopted at an early stage of the wars which have so long agitated that quarter of the globe, nevertheless remains the same; which is not to interfere in the internal concerns of any of its powers; to consider the Government *de facto* as the legitimate Government for us; to cultivate friendly relations with it and

to preserve those relations by a frank, firm and manly policy, meeting in all instances the just claims of every power, submitting to injuries from none. But in regard to those continents circumstances are eminently and conspicuously different. It is impossible that the allied powers should extend their political system to any portion of either continent without endangering our peace and happiness; nor can anyone believe that our southern brethren, if left to themselves, would adopt it of their own accord. It is equally impossible, therefore that we should behold such interposition in any form with indifference. If we look to the comparative strength and resources of Spain and those new Governments, and their distance from each other, it must be obvious that she can never subdue them. It is still the true policy of the United States to leave the parties to themselves in the hope that other powers will pursue the same course."

Speaking of our prosperity, etc. the message says: "To what then do we owe these blessings? It is known to all that we derive them from the excellence of our institutions. Ought we not then to adopt every measure which may be necessary to perpetuate them?"

Continental Europe, on the appearance of the Monroe Doctrine hesitated in its plans. Spain called a conference of the allied powers in 1824 to consider the project, but England refused to join them; after ascertaining her position in this matter, they finally abandoned it entirely.

The House of Representatives in 1826 resolved that "The people of the United States should be left free to act in any crisis in such a manner as their feelings of friendship towards those (Spanish-American) republics and as their own honor may at the time dictate."

The first appearance of the Monroe Doctrine in the internal politics of the United States was almost immediately after its promulgation, its bearing on the part this country should take in the Panama Congress of the South

and Central American States in 1826 being much discussed. The United States was invited to send delegates to this congress and did so; the controversy over the wisdom of this action lasted for some years, and was an unusually ardent one, but resulted practically in nothing.

The United States also notified Europe at various times that it would "resist with all its power the transfer of the island of Cuba to any other power." Jefferson, Gallatin, Jno. Quincy Adams, Jno. C. Calhoun, Henry Clay, Martin Van Buren, Jas. Buchanan, Wm. E. Marcy and others stated it plainly. It had been the unchallenged American doctrine that Cuba should remain with Spain unless it came to the United States; that Spain should hold it in trust; that we should resist its transfer by the whole power of the army and navy, and there it remained until it became free and independent.

Daniel Webster, years afterward, in discussing this declaration by Mr. Monroe, said that "it was wrapped up, he would not say in mysticism, but certainly in phrase sufficiently cautious." Webster said that the whole principle of the Monroe Doctrine was self-preservation. "It is not a slight injury to our interests that makes out a case; it must be danger to our security, manifest and imminent danger to our essential rights and our essential interests." He claimed that if the allied European powers had sent an armament against provinces remote from us as Chili or Argentina—the distance of the scene of action diminishing our apprehension of danger, and diminishing, also, our means of effectual interposition—this might have left us to content ourselves with remonstrance. But if an army had been landed on the shores of Mexico and commenced war in our immediate neighborhood, the event would have called for decided and immediate interference from us.

James K. Polk declared that the Monroe Doctrine applied to the North American Continent alone.

When the Clayton-Bulwer treaty relating to the

Nicaragua canal was negotiated in 1850, this doctrine was again discussed, and it was exploited in Congress and the newspapers, very much in the style with which recent utterances have made us familiar, but the well remembered instance of the French occupation of Mexico is the one case, up to that time, in which it was necessary for this doctrine to be maintained by unequivocal threats of war.

Whenever it was thought necessary to state the American position on this subject Congress passed resolutions similar to this one:

"And whereas, the doctrines and policy proclaimed by President Monroe have since been repeatedly asserted by the United States by executive declaration and action upon occasions and exigencies similar to the particular occasion and exigency which caused them first to be announced, and have been ever since their promulgation, and now are the rightful policy of the United States Therefore

Be it resolved, that the United States of America reaffirms and confirms the doctrine and principles promulgated by President Monroe in his message of December 2, 1823 and declares that it will assert and maintain the doctrine and those principles, and will regard any infringement thereof and particularly any attempt by any European power to take or acquire any new or additional territory on the American continent, or any island adjacent thereto, or any right or sovereignty or dominion in the same, in any case or instance as to which the United States shall deem such attempt to be dangerous to its peace or safety, by or through, force, purchase, cession, occupation, pledge, colonization, protectorate or by control of the easement in any canal or any other means of transit across the American isthmus, whether under unfounded pretension of right in cases of alleged boundary disputes, or under any other unfounded pretensions as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States and as an interposition which it would be

impossible, in any form for the United States to regard with indifference."

There can be no doubt that had it not been for Russia, both England and France would have intervened in the American civil war. When a citizen of the United States referred to the cordiality of Russia and this country and spoke to the Russian Crown Prince about the interest that his Government had taken in American affairs especially at that time, he said:

"Oh, yes! my father told me all about our Russian fleets in the harbors of New York and San Francisco to keep off your foreign enemies." The Russian naval commanders in American waters had sealed instructions from their Government to be opened only in case of war being declared between the United States and a European power. They were, of course, to assist the north, as is well known.

It was not *definitely* known in this country until the recent correspondence was published that the British Ministers in our civil war period *sought every opportunity* to destroy the American Union. Even before the Trent affair Lord Russell wrote on 17 October, 1861 to Lord Palmerston concerning the opinion of the French Minister at Washington that the blockade should be raised by outside force. The whole scheme of finally destroying the Union by European intervention was thus mapped out by the British Foreign Ministers as early as September 17, 1862. Palmerston answered that he thought Russell's plans "excellent." He objected to asking Russia to join in "the offer of mediation, because she would be favorable to the north."

Secretary of State Seward remonstrated with Great Britain as to her premeditated violations of the Monroe Doctrine in the following language: "The Government of the United States will maintain and insist with all the decision and energy which are compatible with our

existing neutrality, that the Republican system which is accepted by any one of those South American States shall not wantonly be assailed, and that it shall not be subverted as an end of a lawful war by European powers. But beyond this position, the United States Government will not go nor will it consider itself hereby bound to take part in wars in which a South American Republic may enter with a European sovereign, when the object of the latter is not the establishment in place of a subverted republic, of a monarchy under a European Prince."

The pretext that Napoleon found to invade Mexico was certain debts alleged to be due citizens of his country.

England and Spain had claims also. A joint expedition was arranged to menace Mexico. Napoleon determined to make this expedition a means of acquiring a foothold which should lead to the establishment of a Latin monarchy in the western hemisphere. The scheme was a revival in another form of the French dream of a great American Empire. The joint expedition consisted of 81 vessels, carrying 1,611 guns and 27,911 sailors and troops. It reached Vera Cruz in December 1861. In the early part of 1862 England and Spain being remonstrated with by the United States and not wishing to act as a tail to the French political kite, arranged with Mexico to withdraw their forces which was done in the following April.

Left alone France reinforced her army notwithstanding the protest of the United States and placed it under the command of General Forney. The undertaking seemed easy to Napoleon. His instructions to Forney were simply to "do it quickly and well." If his project had succeeded it certainly would have been the greatest of his reign. But Mexico resisted heroically for more than four years.

This expedition cost France altogether about forty million dollars. Being intimidated by the French forces, Mexico was made to ratify the election of Maximilian as

hereditary emperor. With the moral assistance of the United States the Mexican war party constantly opposed the Maximilian empire.

In 1866 its civil war being ended the American Government demanded the withdrawal of the French troops from Mexico, as stated by President Johnson in his message to Congress.

### President Johnson's Annual Message, December 1866.

"In the month of April last, as Congress is aware, a friendly arrangement was made between the Emperor of France and the President of the United States for the withdrawal from Mexico of the French military forces. This withdrawal was to be effected in three detachments, the first of which it was understood, would leave Mexico in November, now past, the second in March next, and the third and last in November, 1867.

Immediately upon the completion of the evacuation, the French Government was to assume the same attitude of non-intervention in regard to Mexico as is held by the Government of the United States. Repeated assurances have been given by the Emperer since that agreement that he would complete the promised evacuation within the period mentioned or sooner.

It was reasonably expected that the proceedings thus comtemplated would produce a crisis of great political interest in the Republic of Mexico. The newly appointed minister of the United States, Mr. Campbell, was therefore sent forward on the 9th day of November last to assume his proper functions as minister plenipotentiary of the United States to that country. It was also thought expedient that he should be attended in the vicinity of Mexico by the Lieutenant-General of the army of the United States with the view of obtaining such information as might be important to determine the course to be pur-

sued by the United States in re-establishing and maintaining necessary and proper intercourse with the Republic of Mexico. Deeply interested in the cause of liberty and humanity, it seemed an obvious duty on our part to exercise whatever influence we possessed for the restoration and permanent establishment in that country of a domestic and Republican form of Government.

Such was the condition of our affairs in regard to Mexico, when, on the 22d day of November last, official information was received from Paris that the Emperor of France had some time before decided not to withdraw a detachment of his forces in the month of November past, according to engagement, but that this decision was made with the purpose of withdrawing the whole of those forces in the ensuing spring. Of this determination however, the United States had not received any notice or intimation, and so soon as the information was received by the Government, care was taken to make known its dissent to the Emperor of France.

I cannot forego the hope that France will consider the subject and adopt some resolution in regard to the evacuation of Mexico which will conform as nearly as practicable with the existing engagement and thus meet the just expectations of the United States. It is believed that with the evacuation of Mexico by the expeditionary forces no subject for serious differences between France and the United States would remain. The expressions of the Emperor and people of France warrant a hope that the traditionary friendship between the two countries might in that case be renewed and permanently restored."

Thus diplomatically did the President state the situation. Johnson's remonstrance to Napoleon backed up by General Sheridan on the Rio Grande, brought Napoleon to a realization of the situation. France, of course, seeing that further resistance to the United States would result in serious complications, acquiesced, and the Mexican Republic rose on the ashes of the Maximilian Empire.

The purchase of Russian-America (Alaska) for seven million and two hundred thousand dollars from Russia in 1867 by the United States was another step towards "America for the Americans" and another result of the principles underlying the Monroe Doctrine as is also the expected sale of the Danish West Indies to the American Government.

The Pan-American Congress at Washington was an outcome of the same sentiment. Closer fraternal feeling was advocated between all American republics. A court of arbitration to settle all disputes and a railroad connecting the different countries was projected.

Now that Mexico and certain South American countries have built quite a number of railroads, some of considerable length, it is not believed to be such a prodigious task to connect the United States with the Central and South American countries as was first supposed. This fact, together with the projected building of the Panama canal, serves to bind more firmly the great American republic with her southern sisters both commercially and politically. It makes the Pan-American sentiment stronger than ever, and will continue to do so as time proves their interests to be more and more mutual. Commercial, as well as political considerations, will cause the United States to safeguard and protect her weaker neighbors in every way possible.

### The Venezuelan Controversy.

The boundary dispute between Venezuela and England was of long standing. It was only after the insistence on the part of the United States by President Cleveland that England consented to arbitrate, claiming at first that the matter was not a subject for arbitration. The British Prime Minister Lord Salisbury contended that it was not a case where the Monroe Doctrine applied. The United States, of course, insisted that it did apply.

On the 20th July 1895 Secretary of State Olney sent a note to Ambassador Bayard at London concerning the

threatening state of affairs between Great Britain and Venezuela. Beginning at the very inception of the dispute which had assumed a very grave aspect Mr. Olney carried his argument of the American claim for arbitration based on the Monroe Doctrine, down to that time and gave emphasis to his statements by quoting the sentiments of President Monroe in full, and notes that "its pronouncement by Monroe's administration at that particular time was unquestionably due to the inspiration of Great Britain who at once gave to it an open and unqualified adhesion, which has never been withdrawn." Secretary Olney regarded the doctrine as the embodiment and expression of opposition between Europe and America. He said that Europe being monarchical and America republican, that the former must necessarily be to some extent hostile to democracy, and free institutions of which the latter is the exponent. He regarded self-government as the issue, continuing: "The people of the United States have a vital interest in the cause of popular self-government. They believe it to be for the healing of all nations and that civilization must either advance or retrograde accordingly as its supremacy is extended or curtailed."

Mr. Olney gives in his note a firm indorsement to the principle enunciated by Monroe and defines Great Britain's position in this frank and unambiguous manner. She (Great Britain) says to Venezuela: "You can get none of the debatable land by force because you are not strong enough; you can get none by treaty, because I will not agree, and you can take your chance of getting a portion by arbitration, only if you first agree to abandon to me such portions as I may designate."

Mr. Olney says it is not perceived how such an attitude can be defended nor how it is reconcilable with that love of justice and fair play so eminently characteristic of the English race, and holds that if such a position be adhered to, it should be regarded as amounting in substance

to an invasion and conquest of Venezuelan territory. In conclusion Mr. Olney says that in these circumstances the duty of the President appears to him unmistakable and imperative. To ignore Great Britain's assertion of title and her refusal to have that title investigated, and not to protest and give warning against the substantial appropriation by Great Britain of the territory for her own use, would be to ignore an established policy, with which the honor and welfare of this country are closely identified. He therefore instructed Mr. Bayard to lay the views given before Lord Salisbury and said: "They (the views) call for a definite decision on the point whether Great Britain will consent or will decline to submit the Venezuelan boundary question in its entirety to impartial arbitration."

Expressing the President's hope that the conclusion will be on the side of arbitration, Mr. Olney concludes with the pointed statement that if the President "Is to be disappointed in that hope however—a result not to be anticipated and in his judgment calculated to greatly embarrass the future relations between this country and Great Britain—it is his wish to be made acquainted with the fact at such early date as will enable him to lay the whole subject before congress in his next annual message."

Lord Salisbury's reply is addressed to Sir Julian Pauncefote, the British Ambassador at Washington under date of November 26, 1895. This dealt only with the application of the Monroe Doctrine in the case at issue, and was followed on the same day by another note discussing the boundary dispute *per se.* At the outset Lord Salisbury states so far as he is aware the Monroe Doctrine has never been before advanced on behalf of the United States in any written communication addressed to the Government of another nation. He gives what he believes is the British interpretation of the doctrine, and maintains that the dangers which were apprehended by President Monroe have no relation to the state of things in which we live at

the present day, and adds with thinly covered irony that "it is intelligible that Mr. Olney should invoke in the defense of views on which he is now insisting, an authority (Monroe) which enjoys so high a popularity with his own fellow-countrymen."

"The dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela is a controversy with which" said Lord Salisbury "the United States have no apparent political concern."

Continuing in short, pithy sentences he says "it is difficult, indeed, to see how the question in controversy can materially affect any state or community outside those primarily interested; that the disputed frontier of Venezuela has nothing to do with any of the questions dealt with by President Monroe; that it is not a question of colonization by any European power of any portion of America, nor of the imposition upon the communities of South America of any system of government devised in Europe."

"It is" he says "simply the determination of the frontier of a British possession which belonged to the throne of England long before the republic of Venezuela came into existence."

As he proceeds in the discussion the language of Lord Salisbury becomes tart. He argues in theory that the Monroe Doctrine in itself is sound, but disclaims any intention of being understood as expressing any acceptance of it on the part of her Majesty's Government. He quotes Mr. Olney as saying: "That distance, three thousand miles of intervening ocean make any political union between a European and American State unnatural and inexpedient will hardly be denied;" and adds that "the meaning of these words is that the union between Great Britain and Canada, Jamaica and Trinidad; between Great Britain and British Honduras or British Guiana are inexpedient and unnatural."

"President Monroe," said his lordship, "disclaims any such inference from his doctrine, but in this as in other respects Mr. Olney develops it." "He lays down" said Lord

Salisbury "that the inexpedient and unnatural character of the union between a European and an American State is so obvious that it will hardly be denied. Her Majesty's Government are prepared emphatically to deny it on behalf of both the British and American people, who are subject to her crown. They maintain that the union between Great Britain and her territories in the western hemisphere is both natural and expedient. But they are not prepared to admit that the recognition of that expediency is clothed with the sanction which belongs to the adoption of international law. They are not prepared to admit that the interests of the United States are necessarily concerned in every frontier dispute which may arise between any two of the states who possess dominion in the western hemisphere; and still less can they accept the doctrine that the United States are entitled to claim that the process of arbitration shall be applied to any demand for the surrender of territory which one of those states may make against another."

Lord Salisbury concludes with the statement that her Majesty's Government have not surrendered the hope that the controversy between themselves and Venezuela will be adjusted by reasonable arrangements at an early date.

The second note of November 26 is wholly devoted to a discussion of the boundary dispute, exclusive of its relation to the Monroe Doctrine. This dispatch however sounds the keynote of Great Britain's position with reference to Mr. Olney's representations. Lord Salisbury states that Great Britain has repeatedly expressed its readiness to submit to arbitration the conflicting claims of Great Britain to territory of great mineral values, and follows this statement with these important words: "But they (the British Government) cannot consent to entertain or to submit to the arbitration of another power or a foreign jurist, however eminent, claims based on extravagant pretensions of Spanish Officials in the last century

and involving the transfer of large numbers of British subjects, who have for many years enjoyed the settled rule of the British Colony, to a nation of different race and language, whose political system is subject to frequent disturbance, and whose institutions as yet too often afford very inadequate protection to life and property. No issue of this description has ever been involved in the questions which Great Britain and the United States have consented to submit to arbitration and her majesty's Government are convinced that in similar circumstances the Government of the United States would be equally firm in declining to entertain proposals of such a nature."

President Cleveland sent the following vigorous message to Congress on the subject: To the Congress: In my annual message addressed to Congress on the 3d inst. I called attention to the pending boundary controversy between Great Britain and the republic of Venezuela, and recited the substance of a representation made by this Government to her Brittanic Majesty's Government, suggesting reasons why such dispute should be submitted to arbitration for settlement and inquiring whether it would be so submitted.

The answer of the British Government, which was then awaited, has since been received and together with the dispatch to which it is a reply, is hereto appended.

Such reply is embodied in two communications addressed by the British Prime Minister to Sir Julian Pauncefote the British Ambassador at this Capital. It will be seen that one of these communications is devoted exclusively to observations upon the Monroe Doctrine and claims that in the present instance new and strange extension and development of this doctrine are insisted on by the United States, that the reasons justifying an appeal to the doctrine enunciated by President Monroe are generally inapplicable to the state of things in which we live at the present day and especially inapplicable to a controversy

involving the boundary line between Great Britain and Venezuela.

Without attempting an extended argument in reply to these positions it may not be amiss to suggest that the doctrine upon which we stand is strong and sound, because its enforcement is important to our peace and safety as a nation, and is essential to the integrity of our free institutions and the tranquil maintenance of our distinctive form of Government. It was intended to apply to every stage in our national lifeand cannot become obsolete while our republic endures. If the balance of power is justly a cause for jealous anxiety among the Governments of the old world and a subject for our absolute non-interference, none the less is an observance of the Monroe Doctrine of vital concern to our people and their Government.

Assuming therefore that we may probably insist upon this doctrine without regard to "the state of things in which we live," or any changed condition here or elsewhere, it is not apparent why its application may not be invoked in the present controversy.

If a European power, by extension of its boundaries takes possession of the territory of one of our neighboring republics against its will and in derogation of its rights, it is difficult to see why to that extent, such European power does not thereby attempt to extend its system of Government to that portion of this continent which is thus taken. This is the precise action which President Monroe declared to be "dangerous to our peace and safety," and it can make no difference whether the European system is extended by an absence of frontier or otherwise.

It is also suggested in the British reply "that we should not seek to apply the Monroe Doctrine to the pending dispute because it does not embody any principle of international law, which is founded on the general consent of nations" and that "no statesman however eminent, and no nation however powerful are competent to insert into

the code of international law a novel principle which was never recognized before, and which has not since been accepted by the Government of any other country."

Practically the principle for which we contend has peculiar, if not exclusive relation to the United States. It may not have been admitted in so many words to the code of international law, but since in international counsels every nation is entitled to the rights belonging to it, if the enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine is something we may justly claim, it has its place in the code of international law as certainly and as securely as if it were specifically mentioned; and when the United States is a suitor before the high tribunal that administers international law the question to be determined is whether or not we present claims which the justice of that code of law can find to be right and valid.

The Monroe Doctrine finds its recognition in those principles of international law which are based upon the theory that every nation will have its rights protected and its just claims enforced.

Of course this Government is entirely confident that under the sanction of this doctrine we have clear rights and undoubted claims. Nor is this ignored in the British reply. The Prime Minister, while not admitting that the Monroe Doctrine is applicable to present conditions states "in declaring that the United States would resist any such enterprise if it was contemplated, President Monroe adopted a policy which received the entire sympathy of the English Government of that date."

He further declares, "though the language of President Monroe is directed to the attainment of objects which most Englishmen would agree to be statutory, it is impossible to admit, that they have been inscribed by any adequate authority in the code of international law."

Again he says "They (her Majesty's Government) fully concur with the view which President Monroe apparently entertained, that any disturbance of existing

territory distribution in that hemisphere by any fresh acquisitions on the part of any European state would be a highly inexpedient charge."

In the belief that the doctrine for which we contend was clear and definite, that it was founded on substantial considerations and involved our safety and welfare, that it was fully applicable to our present condition and to the state of the world's progress, and that it was directly related to the pending controversy, and without any convictions as to the final merits of the dispute, but anxious to learn in a satisfactory and conclusive manner whether Great Britain sought under a claim of boundary to extend her possessions on this continent, without right, or whether she merely sought possession of territory fairly included within her lines of ownership, this Government proposed to the Government of Great Britain a resort to arbitration as a proper means of settling the question, to the end that a vexatious boundary dispute between the two contestants might be determined and our exact standing and relation in respect to the controversy might be made clear. It will be seen from the correspondence herewith submitted that this proposition has been declined by the British Government upon grounds which in the circumstances seem to me to be far from satisfactory. It is deeply disappointing that such an appeal, actuated by the most friendly feelings toward both nations directly concerned, addressed to the sense of justice and to the magnanimity of one of the great powers of the world, and touching its relations to one comparatively weak and small, should have produced no better results.

The course to be pursued by this Government in view of the present condition does not appear to admit of serious doubt. Having labored faithfully for many years to induce Great Britain to submit this dispute to impartial arbitration and having been now finally apprised of her refusal to do so, nothing remains but to accept the situation, to recognize its plain requirements and deal with it ac-

cordingly. Great Britain's present proposition has never thus far been regarded as admissible by Venezuela, though any adjustment of the boundaries which that country may deem for her advantage and may enter into of her own free will cannot of course, be objected to by the United States.

Assuming that the attitude of Venezuela, will remain unchanged, the dispute has reached such a stage as to make it now incumbent upon the United States to take measures to determine with sufficient certainty for its justification what is the true divisional line between the republic of Venezuela and British Guiana.

The inquiry to that end should, of course, be conducted carefully and judiciously, and due weight should be given to all available evidence, records and facts in support of the claims of both parties.

In order that such examinations should be prosecuted in a thorough and satisfactory manner, I suggest that the Congress make an adequate appropriation for the expenses of a commission, to be appointed by the executive, who shall make the necessary investigation and report upon the matter with the least possible delay. When such report is made and accepted it will, in my opinion, be the duty of the United States to resist by every means in its power, as a willful aggression upon its rights and interests, the appropriation by Great Britian of any lands or the exercise of governmental jurisdiction over any territory which after investigation, we have determined of right belong to Venezuela.

In making these recommendations I am fully alive to the responsibility incurred, and keenly realize all the consequences that may follow. I am, nevertheless, firm in my conviction that while it is a grievous thing to contemplate the two great English speaking people of the world as being otherwise than friendly competitors in the onward march of civilization and strenuous and

worthy rivals in all the arts of peace; there is no calamity which a great nation can invite which equals that which follows a supine submission to wrong and injustice and the consequent loss of national self respect and honor beneath which are shielded and defended a people's safety and greatness.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

*Executive Mansion, December 17, 1895.*

---

It has been claimed in some quarters that possible Russian and other complications were instrumental in forcing England to arbitrate the question. Be that as it may, suffice it to know that she did yield, although only after considerable correspondence. None the less is the credit due Cleveland's administration.

Secretary Frelinghuysen, correcting an erroneous impression that seemed to prevail in certain countries that the Monroe Doctrine placed the United States in the position of a bully, stated: "It is not the inhospitable principle it is sometimes charged with being, and which asserts that European nations shall not retain dominion on this hemisphere and that none but republican governments shall be tolerated here; for we know that a large part of the North American continent is under the dominion of her majesty's government, and that the United States were in the past the first to recognize the imperial authority in Brazil of Emperor Dom Pedro, and in Mexico of Iturbide."

On January 31, 1896 Lord Salisbury delivered a speech in London in the course of which he rebutted the statement made by John Morley to the electors at Arbroath, Scotland, concerning the Monroe Doctrine. Mr. Morley claimed that Lord Salisbury had blundered in seeming to question this doctrine. Salisbury replied that

although the Monroe Doctrine formed no part of international law, his dispatch to Secretary of State, Olney, supported it as a rule of policy as strongly and distinctly as possible but in the form in which President Monroe himself understood it.

Another British official, Rt. Hon. Arthur Balfour, stated that Americans need have no fear of England opposing the Monroe Doctrine. He dilated upon it, construing it to mean that the American continent must not be regarded as a field for European colonization and that European nations were not entitled to interfere in the domestic affairs of the new world. He said that the United States and England concurred in this construction.

He also said he was not aware that there had been any change of mind, and did not believe it would be possible to find an individual in his country who was desirous of what is known as a forward policy in America. Great Britain was content and had always been content, to do the best for the colonies she possessed there and did not wish to interfere with other states or acquire more territory. He believed that if the Venezuelan Government had requested British protection the honor would have been declined by every statesman nameable. He referred respectively to the long duration of the boundary dispute, to Lord Salisbury's dispatch, to the progress of compiling documents relating to the matter here and to the appointment of a United States commission to determine the boundary, and added that it would be hard indeed if the common sense of the Anglo-Saxon race was unable to settle any dispute without war. Referring to the settlement of British claims against Venezuela, the Duke of Devonshire, Lord President of the Council, said: "Great Britain accepted the Monroe Doctrine unreservedly, but to have abstained from enforcing claims which she believed to be just and essential to her honor would be to make the Monroe Doctrine an object of dislike for every civilized power."

The German Prime Minister, Prince Bismarck regarded the Monroe Doctrine as impertinence. Without publicly accepting it as a part of international law, he, however, never overtly violated it. Early in 1903 immediately after the reference of European claims on Venezuela to the Hague court of arbitration the present German Premier, replying to the criticism of his countrymen for consulting the United States in the matter, stated:

"The United States' participation in the settlement of the Venezuela controversy is regarded, in many quarters, as unfortunate, and as hindering the result of the negotiations. Certainly, we would have reached the object desired more rapidly and better, if we had been let alone with Venezuela, but every politician who knows the A. B. C's of this question, knew absolutely in advance that we would not be let alone.

Means for eliminating the United States from the controversy of the European powers with Venezuela there were not and there are not now. The patriotic publicists, who call for treating this question according to the Bismarckian method, can rest assured that this method is being applied; carefully nursing the friendship of the United States is a Bismarckian tradition, as documents testify. In his relations with the United States he never wore 'cuirassier's boots,' as is now so often demanded, and in the Samoan question he was perhaps less exacting than his present successor."

The American people, ever since the promulgation of the Monroe Doctrine in 1823, have insisted on a strict adherence to that policy by the various administrations. An unbroken record for consistency to its principles has been preserved by every act of the United States government. Even at times when, to one unfamiliar with the institutions of this country, it might seem that the doctrine would be abandoned, or at any rate impaired; that view was soon found to be erroneous, for whenever it was in

danger of being attacked, fresh resolutions were passed as soon thereafter as practicable, announcing a firm determination to defend it at all hazards, always with the desired effect.

The opinion is thoroughly grounded in the American mind that not only for the protection of its own country but also for the peace and safety of Central and South America it is absolutely necessary that foreign political influence be excluded. That if these countries were open to European colonization they would immediately become bones of contention, followed by ceaseless foreign wars. That not only should they be free from European influence but that it is essential to the welfare of the United States that it should be surrounded by republican governments so far as possible.

The smaller republics of America have hitherto feared that the Monroe Doctrine was only a ruse to control and eventually to seize and incorporate them into the United States. Eminent Europeans were fond of repeating their opinions that this is the ultimate object of the American policy. But the Latin republics are gradually, although none the less surely, changing their views on this subject; Chili has already notified the United States that she unreservedly accepts the Monroe Doctrine both in letter and spirit; Argentina and other South American governments are expected to do likewise.

Although the anti-American parties of Central and South America still suspect the United States of hostile designs upon them, her action in promptly giving freedom and independence to Cuba has convinced many of them of the sincerity of her promises. The influence of the United States constantly increases over the whole western hemisphere.

While the Monroe Doctrine has been the means of preserving the other American republics from annihilation by European powers, if that were the sole object of this

doctrine it would not be worth the while of the United States to uphold it. For those governments with few exceptions are merely dictatorships under the guise of "republics." Did not the American government realize that it is necessary for her own safety as well as the ultimate development of republican institutions elsewhere, it would not consider "the game worth the candle."

Central and South America is composed principally of Spanish-speaking people among whom the Indian admixture greatly predominates; Indians and those partly of that race constitute about three-quarters of the total population. Only about one-fourth of the entire population consists of pure-blooded Spanish descendants, merchants and others from the United States, England, Germany and elsewhere. They practically constitute the educated class. This small portion is the progressive element; in them lies the only hope of civilization and progress. The other three-quarters are so densely ignorant and illiterate and so crushed with superstition as to be beyond all hope for many years to come. This ignorant majority offers a constant temptation to renegades, desperadoes and the like for political aggrandizement. The consequence of which is that, with a very few exceptions, those countries are in a chronic state of revolution and upheaval. The disappointed aspirant seizes the first opportunity to remove, either by assassination or otherwise, his opponent for the "presidency;" after seizing the office he holds it until displaced by some other revolutionist. Diaz, although giving Mexico the best Government in her history, has been virtual dictator for about a score of years.

Of course it is not contended that there are no honorable exceptions to the political adventurers in Central and South American countries. But it is contended that three-fourths of those people are practically incapable of self-government and that the other fourth does not, as a

matter of fact, give those countries a republican form of government, with possibly three exceptions. Among those South Americans that are worthy to be honored as true patriots may be mentioned Simon Bolivar, the hero of South American independence, the Washington of Latin America. It has been well said of him, "he expended nine-tenths of a splendid patrimony in the service of his country; and although he had for a considerable period unlimited control over the revenues of three countries—Bolivia (named after him), Colombia and Peru—he died without a shilling of the public money in his possession. He secured the independence of three states and called forth a spirit in the southern portion of the new world which can never be extinguished. He purified the administration of justice, and he induced other countries to recognize the independence of those countries." Their so-called elections in most instances are decided not by ballots, but by bullets.

In the discussion in Congress anent the Panama canal treaty Senator Morgan of Alabama brought forward facts to prove that the then existing Colombian Government could not constitutionally surrender control of or lease the right-of-way across the isthmus; the administration Senators intimated that there was never a *de-jure* Government there and that if necessary the United States would simply take possession by force under color of the title received from Colombia.

Notwithstanding the gloomy outlook for civilization in those turbulent countries, a continuous immigration from Europe and the United States together with those great agencies of modern advancement, steam and electricity, is slowly but none the less surely making a change for the better. Superstition, illiteracy and anarchy will have to yield to progress.

In the whole existence of the United States, Monroe's administration was the most opportune for the promulgation of such a doctrine as this. His was pre-eminently

the "era of good feeling," never were the different sections of the country more thoroughly united and more in unison. Not being distracted with internal bickerings, the country was better able to guard its foreign as well as domestic interests.

It could present a more solid front to the outside world than at times when the people were not so thoroughly united. Although the United States was then young and comparatively feeble, nevertheless with her incomparable position, isolated, and surrounded by no powerful nations, hers was and is to-day a commanding situation.

The United States is careful to impress upon South and Central America that the Monroe Doctrine is not intended as a shield for violations of international laws. Cleveland did not deny the right of the British to land marines at Corinto, Central America; nor did Roosevelt prevent England, Germany and Italy from bombarding Venezuelan forts to exact a money indemnity, where no territorial seizure was attempted.

## Influence of the United States on Europe.

NOT only is the American Government a model for the Central and South American republics but it has always been a beacon-light for free institutions the world over. Every country on the globe has benefited either directly or indirectly by its example. At first considered only an experiment it is now acknowledged everywhere to be a demonstration, a living proof of the success of "government of the people, for the people and by the people."

When Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence he "shook every throne in Europe." Realizing this fact, the European monarchies never ceased their attempts to effect the destruction of this government. Not only did England utilize the Indian savages in her warfare against the United States, but made use of every means possible to accomplish her ends. During the Madison administration Great Britain sent a secret agent to Boston to engender strife between the different sections of this country and to breed discontent with the government. She encouraged the English abolitionists in their agitation against American slavery, solely for the purpose of dividing the north and south. The ultimate idea of France, Spain and England, in destroying the Mexican republic, evidently was to have monarchical governments both north (Canada) and south (Maximilian Empire) of the United States and the Confederacy; they hoped thus after the United States was weakened by being divided into two governments to take advantage of any opportunity to subjugate either or both of them.

Although Great Britain did not openly assist the south, as she led many to believe, she secretly aided the secessionists to such an extent that she was compelled to pay the United States fifteen million dollars in damages

after the civil war. Against the Union cause, during the war between the states, the European powers, with the exception of Russia, were a unit. Of course this was not so much the sentiment of the common people as of the ruling classes there.

Both England and her possessions benefited by the influence of American institutions, for her colonies immediately felt its effect and Great Britain also later on. The success of popular government in the United States taught England a very valuable lesson in colonial affairs; so much so, that Canada and Australia are practically free now.

To Ireland which seems to be the last of the countries under British dominion to reap any benefit from the liberal laws for which England has been noted so long, the indirect benefit of republican institutions has been enormous. The success of popular rule here has lessened British prejudice against the capacity of the Irish for self-government; and although they have not yet acquired "home rule," they are at least given a nominal voice in political affairs and have had many unjust and cruel restrictions removed.

Not only in her possessions but even at home England has experienced many benefits from the example of our governmental system. Formerly it was the classes only that participated in that government; now it is also the masses, for people are at present allowed the right of suffrage there that were hitherto considered utterly incapable of its exercise.

When the French soldiers returned home from the American Revolutionary war, they scattered the germs of republicanism not only over France but eventually throughout Europe. Although France is now proverbial for her peasant proprietorship, the miserable condition of the peasantry there and in the remainder of continental Europe may be understood when it is remembered that at the time of the Declaration of American Independence one hundred and fifty thousand of the privileged classes in

France owned two-thirds of the soil; and the remaining twenty-five millions of people had only one-third. It was the republican ideas from America that assisted in bringing about the great French revolution.

When Germany and other countries of continental Europe were ground down under the iron heels of despotic princes and kings, Napoleon's army (although in one sense a scourge), imbued with the ideas of liberty that many of them obtained in America, released the peasantry to some extent from their intolerable burdens. At the time of the establishment of the American republic, Europe, with the exception of Great Britain, was practically a despotism; owing partially to the influence of popular government in the United States, that continent has improved wonderfully in political affairs.

The United States by becoming a "world power," in the estimation of many people, loses her right to insist on the Monroe Doctrine. They believe that consistency compels her either to refrain from "meddling" in the affairs of the "old world," or allow other powers to do the same in this hemisphere. But they should remember that progressive countries are more inclined to broaden their policies than to contract them. The great modern inventions have so changed conditions that they have not only almost annihilated space, making all peoples of the world practically neighbors, but have forced us in self-defense to leave our former seclusion and participate more in the political affairs of the world. For whatever affects the politics of a country indirectly affects its commerce. Although we may not take a direct interest in the concerns of China, for instance, whenever its governmental policy is so manipulated as to injure our trade with that country we are of necessity forced into the matter, to the extent of protecting ourselves.

While the United States has increased wonderfully in population and territory, no less wonderful is her financial record; she has the greatest wealth and the least indebtedness of any first-class power.

## Life of President James Monroe.

JAMES MONROE, the fifth President of the United States, was born on the 28th of April, 1758 in Westmoreland County, Virginia; his parents were Spence and Elizabeth (née Jones) Monroe, also natives of that state; they were said to have descended from a family of Scotch cavaliers who traced their ancestry to Hector Monroe, a captain in the army of King Charles I. This family settled at an early period in Virginia with other cavalier immigrants.

At an early age the future President showed great decision of character. He was a student at William and Mary College in Virginia when the revolutionary war commenced; he left college and volunteered as a cadet in the continental army and was present at several battles. He participated in the New Jersey engagements of 1776 and was wounded in the retreat through that state, serving as Lieutenant; he was then promoted to Captain of infantry.

Upon recovery he was placed as aid-de-camp on the staff of General William Alexander (Lord Stirling) with the rank of Major, where he served until the following year with distinction. Upon the recommendation of General Washington he was appointed Colonel. In 1780 Jefferson delegated him to visit the army in South Carolina on an important mission.

Returning to his native state he studied law with Jefferson, who was then Governor of Virginia; so intimate did Monroe become with Jefferson and Madison that they influenced his future political course to a great extent. He was elected to the Virginia Assembly by King George County in 1782 and was chosen by that body a member of the Executive Council of State. In 1783 he

was selected as a delegate to the Continental Congress and remained a member until 1786, actively participating in the framing of the new constitution. While a member of Congress he married Miss Kortright of New York City.

At the expiration of his congressional term he engaged in the practice of law at Fredericksburg, Va., but was almost immediately elected to the State Legislature. He was chosen in 1788 a delegate to the State Convention assembled to consider the Federal Constitution; dreading the too-centralized power of the Federal Government, he, together with Patrick Henry and other states-rights advocates, opposed in the Virginia Convention of 1788 the adoption of the constitution.

After the formation of the new government he was a candidate for Congress against Madison but was defeated. The Legislature of the state elected him to the United States Senate in 1790 in the place of William Grayson, deceased; true to his states-rights views he actively opposed the Federalist administration of Washington, remaining in the Senate three years. Although an opponent of his administration Washington appointed him Minister to France, to succeed the Federalist, Governor Morris, whose recall the French Government requested. Washington hoped to appease that government by his appointment of an anti-Federalist, as France suspected the partiality of the Federalist element of the administration towards England. It was supposed that the former confidential relations of the two countries would be restored by the selection of Monroe; it was also expected to soothe the feelings of that portion of the American people who thought that France was due more recompense than had been given her for the assistance rendered in the revolutionary war.

France received Monroe cordially as a representative of the political party in America supposed to be in full accord with that country. He proved so enthusiastic in his French sympathies that the administration was afraid

that he might compromise the neutral position assumed by the United States towards the European powers.

John Jay had concluded a treaty with Great Britain at which France took great offense, claiming it to be in violation of her treaty of 1778 with the United States. Washington and his cabinet, thinking that Monroe should have allayed the strained relations between the United States and France, recalled him in 1796. Feeling aggrieved at this treatment, he issued a pamphlet of about five hundred pages, called the "View," defending his actions in the matter. Shortly after his return to America he was again elected to the Legislature.

The French or Democratic party in Virginia believing Monroe to have been sacrificed for his devotion to liberal principles made him Governor in 1799 to which office he was re-elected.

He was sent in 1802 by President Jefferson to Paris to negotiate with R. R. Livingston the purchase of New Orleans. They succeeded so well that they acquired the entire territory known as the Louisiana Purchase and with such little difficulty that the whole transaction was accomplished in about two weeks.

Monroe was soon afterwards appointed Minister to England to replace Rufus King. He went in 1804 to Spain for the purpose of buying Florida; failing in this, in 1805 he returned to England. In 1806 he undertook with William Pinkney to procure a new treaty with Great Britain in place of the one negotiated by Jay; they succeeded in arranging with the British commissioners, Lords Auckland and Howick, another treaty more favorable to the United States than the previous one. But as it did not prevent England from impressing American seamen into the British service, it was not submitted to the Senate for ratification, but was returned for revision. Monroe was very much provoked at this action of the administration. As Foreign Secretary Canning, who succeeded Fox, refused to negotiate further, Monroe returned

to the United States and published, in defense of his actions in this matter, another pamphlet.

Although Virginia declared in 1808 in favor of Monroe for the Presidency, he withdrew his name after it was brought forward by his friends. He was elected to the State Legislature once more in 1810 and in 1811 he was chosen Governor. Jefferson having healed the political breach between him and his opponents, Madison selected him this year for the office of Secretary of State in place of Robert Smith, where he was instrumental in bringing on the war of 1812 with England.

As Brigadier General Armstrong retired after the capture and devastation of Washington City, the duties of the war as well as of the state department were assumed by Monroe, who conducted them with much more energy than had been heretofore done by the Democratic-Republican party.

In 1816 he was chosen President by 128 electoral votes against 34 and in 1820 was re-elected practically without opposition, such being his popularity at that time that only one electoral vote was cast against him. His eight years as President are historically known as "the era of good feeling," the old issues having practically died out and the new ones not yet having been formed. Those able leaders, John C. Calhoun, John Quincy Adams, William Wirt and W. H. Crawford were selected for his cabinet.

The country had long been injured by foreign troubles and President Monroe saw the opportunity for benefiting the nation. He succeeded in arranging the boundary lines of the Louisiana Purchase and in negotiating the acquisition of Florida from Spain; he also settled the vexatious slavery extension question by the Missouri compromise. But of course, his greatest claim to fame and popularity rests on the promulgation of his famous doctrine; he is also known for his recognition of the independence of the Central and South American States.

How devoted he was to popular governments and how true he was to his principles can be seen in no better way than in his constant watchfulness over the American republics as evinced in his message to Congress both before and after the promulgation of the Monroe Doctrine.

In his first annual message, 2 Dec. 1817 he states:

"It was anticipated at an early stage that the contest between Spain and the colonies would become highly interesting to the United States. It was natural that our citizens should sympathize in events that affected our neighbors. It seemed probable also that the prosecution of the conflict along our coast and in contiguous countries would occasionally interrupt our commerce and otherwise affect the persons and property of our citizens. These anticipations have been realized. Such injuries have been received from persons acting under authority of both the parties and for which redress has in most instances been withheld. Through every stage of the conflict the United States have maintained an impartial neutrality, giving aid to neither of the parties in men, money, ships or munitions of war.

They have regarded the contest not in the light of an ordinary insurrection or rebellion, but as a civil war beteen parties nearly equal, having as to neutral powers equal rights. Our ports have been open to both, and every article, the fruit of our soil or the industry of our citizens, which either was permitted to take, has been equally free to the other. Should the colonies establish their independence, it is proper now to state that this government neither seeks nor would accept from them any advantage in commerce or otherwise which will not be equally open to all other nations. The colonies will in that event become independent states, free from any obligation to or connection with us which it may not then be their interest to form on the basis of a fair reciprocity.

In the civil war existing between Spain and the Spanish provinces in this hemisphere the greatest care has

been taken to enforce the laws intended to preserve an impartial neutrality. Our ports have continued to be equally open to both parties and on the same conditions, and our citizens have been equally restrained from interfering in favor of either to the prejudice of the other. The progress of the war however has operated manifestly in favor of the colonies. * * *

This contest has from its commencement been very interesting to other powers and to none more so than to the United States. A virtuous people may and will confine themselves within the limit of a strict neutrality; but it is not in their power to behold a conflict so vitally important to their neighbors without the sensibility and sympathy which naturally belong to such a case. It has been the steady purpose of this Government to prevent that feeling leading to excess, and it is very gratifying to have it in my power to state that so strong has been the sense throughout the whole community of what was due to the character and obligations of the nation that very few examples of a contrary kind have occurred.

The distance of the colonies from the parent country and the great extent of their population and resources gave them advantages which it was anticipated at a very early period would be difficult for Spain to surmount. The steadiness, consistency and success with which they have pursued their object as evinced more particularly by the undisturbed sovereignty which Buenos Ayres has so long enjoyed, evidently give them a strong claim to the favorable consideration of other nations. These sentiments on the part of the United States have not been withheld from other powers with whom it is desirable to act in concert.

Should it become manifest to the world that the efforts of Spain to subdue these provinces will be fruitless it may be presumed that the Spanish Government itself will give up the contest. In producing such a determination it cannot be doubted that the opinion of friendly

powers who have taken no part in the controversy will have their merited influence."

Unquestionably it is owing more to Monroe than to any other one man that the Latin republics were preserved from destruction, for he was constantly on the alert to protect their interests. In almost all of his messages he shows his interest in their success. He states in his Fourth Annual Message 14 November, 1820:

"The contest between Spain and the colonies, according to the most authenic information, is maintained by the latter with improved success. The unfortunate divisions which were known to exist some time since at Buenos Ayres it is understood still prevail. In no part of South America has Spain made any impression on the colonies, while in many parts and particularly in Venezuela and New Granada, the colonies have gained strength and acquired reputation both for the management of the war in which they have been successful and for the order of the internal administration. The late change in the government of Spain, by the re-establishment of the constitution of 1812 is an event which promises to be favorable to the revolution. Under the authority of the Cortes the Congress of Angostura was invited to open a negotiation for the settlement of differences between the parties, to which it was replied that they would willingly open the negotiation provided the acknowledgment of their independence was made its basis but not otherwise. Of further proceedings between them we are uninformed.

No facts are known to this government to warrant the belief that any of the powers of Europe will take part in the contest, whence it may be inferred, considering all circumstances which must have weight in producing the result, that an adjustment will finally take place on the basis proposed by the colonies. To promote that result by friendly counsels, with other powers, including Spain herself, has been the uniform policy of this government."

That his vigilance suffered no diminution is clearly seen by his eighth annual message (after the Monroe Doctrine proper was promulgated.)

EIGHTH ANNUAL MESSAGE DECEMBER 7, 1824.

"In turning our attention to the condition of the civilized world, in which the United States have always taken a deep interest, it is gratifying to see how large a portion of it is blessed with peace. The only wars which now exist within that limit are those between Turkey and Greece, in Europe and between Spain and the new governments, our neighbors, in this hemisphere. In both these wars the cause of independence, of liberty and humanity continues to prevail. * * *

With respect to the contest to which our neighbors are a party, it is evident that Spain as a power is scarcely felt in it. These new states had completely achieved their independence before it was acknowledged by the United States and they have since maintained it with little foreign pressure. The disturbances which have appeared in certain portions of that vast territory have proceeded from internal causes, which had their origin in their former governments and have not yet been thoroughly removed.

It is manifest that these causes are daily losing effect and that these new states are settling down under governments elective and representative in every branch, similar to our own. In this course we ardently wish them to persevere, under a firm conviction that it will promote their happiness. In this their career, however, we have not interfered, believing that every people have a right to institute for themselves the government which, in their judgment, may suit them best.

Our example is before them, of the good effect of which, being our neighbors, they are competent judges, and to their judgment we leave it in the expectation that other powers will pursue the same policy. The deep interest which we take in their independence, which we

have acknowledged, and in their enjoyment of all the rights incident thereto, especially in the very important one of instituting their own governments, has been declared and is known to the world.

Separated as we are from Europe by the great Atlantic Ocean, we can have no concern in the wars of the European Governments nor in the causes which produce them. The balance of power between them, into whichever scale it may turn in its various vibrations, cannot affect us.

It is the interest of the United States to preserve the most friendly relations with every power and on conditions fair, equal and applicable to all. But in regard to our neighbors our situation is different. It is impossible for the European Governments to interfere in their concerns, especially in those alluded to, which are vital, without affecting us; indeed the motive which might induce such interference in the present state of the war between the parties, if a war it may be called, would appear to be equally applicable to us. It is gratifying to know that some of the powers with whom we enjoy a very friendly intercourse, and to whom these views have been communicated, have appeared to acquiesce in them."

After Monroe's retirement from the Presidency he accepted the office of Justice of the Peace at his old home Oak Hill, Loudon County, Va.; while there he took great interest in the University of Virginia, visiting it constantly.

At his death, 4 July 1831, in New York, he left two daughters Mrs. Hay and Mrs. Samuel S. Gouverneur who resided in that city and with the latter of whom he lived. To these daughters he left a considerable fortune derived from an uncle and from grants of Congress. In 1858 his remains were removed from New York to Richmond, Va.

While Monroe was no orator, he was a man of exalted character, sound judgment, great firmness and energy together with gentle manners and steadfast purpose. His

excessive generosity kept him constantly in debt, being known as a poor manager of his own private affairs. His name will always be enshrined in history as one of our greatest Presidents and a true exponent of popular rights.

# GEO. H. MORRILL & CO.,

17 TO 31 VANDEWATER STREET,

NEW YORK.

MANUFACTURERS OF

## PRINTING AND LITHOGRAPHIC INKS

BOSTON. CHICAGO. SAN FRANCISCO.

# Southworth Company,

MANUFACTURERS OF

## Bonds, Linens, Ledgers and ...Writing Papers...

MITTINEAGUE, MASS.

# Plymouth Paper Co.,

PAPER
MANUFACTURERS,

HOLYOKE, x x x x MASS.

Attention! **PRINTERS!** Attention!

HAVE YOU USED

## BLUE RIDGE RECORD

IN FLATS AND RULED HEADINGS ?

IF NOT, YOU HAVE MISSED A x x x **GOOD THING.**

DON'T DELAY, BUT WRITE AT ONCE FOR SAMPLES AND PRICES.

## Antietam Paper Co.,

HAGERSTOWN, MARYLAND.

The UP-TO-DATE Paper House .....

# P. E. PURSE,

# "THE PRINTER,"

SAVANNAH, GA.

HEADQUARTERS FOR

BILL HEADS,
NOTE HEADS.
LETTER HEADS,
STATEMENTS,
ENVELOPES,
CARDS, TAGS, ETC.

# THE WHITLOCK



TWO-REVOLUTION . . . . . .
. . . . . FOUR-ROLLER PRESS.
FRONT FLY DELIVERY.

## The Whitlock Printing Press M'f'g Co.

...OF DERBY, CONNECTICUT...

## SALES OFFICES . . . . .

NEW YORK, 121 Times Building. 41 Park Row.
BOSTON, 309 Weld Building, 176 Federal Street.

SOUTHERN AGENTS:

J. H. SCHROETER & BRO., 44 West Mitchell Street, Atlanta, Ga.

WESTERN AGENTS:

AMERICAN TYPE FOUNDERS' CO., Chicago, St. Louis, Cleveland, Cincinnati, Minneapolis, Kansas City, Denver, Los Angeles and San Francisco.

EUROPEAN AGENTS:

T. W. & C. B. SHERIDAN, 46 Farringdon Street, London England.